

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☒ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

SR/CA/E

EXTENSION

7168

NO.

5X-4103

DATE

28 February 1964

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1

RID/AN

7C

2

RID/MIS

JB

3

4

SR/CA/E

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

Please classify
into file
74-424-2913 and
index numerals
marked.

Not correct
by RID

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

14-134-2913	
ABSTRACT	INDEX
X	X
DATE 28 Feb 64	



SECRET



CONFIDENTIAL

INTERNAL
USE ONLY

UNCLASSIFIED

SUBJECT: ⁰ General situation in the Ukraine, October 1963

SOURCE: ⁰ *KIS', Pavlo of Babylon, N.Y.

DATE: 28 Feb 1964

*DOB 02/18/1919 born Radekhiv, Austria-Hungary
Citizen, U.S.A. Present Residence: Babylon, N.Y. 11603
Travelled to USSR Oct-63 to meet his sons*

5X-4203
28 Feb 64

1. Source is US citizen, Ukrainian, in the States since 1950, married, about 65 years old, former primary school teacher in Radekhiv-region, West Ukraine. Together with his wife Source visited from 7 to 17 October 1963 his son KIS Yaroslav in LVOV, wul. Zhovtneva (former Pelchynska), Ukraine.

*KIS, Yaroslav Pavlovych is Docent of History (specializing in Ukrainian history of XIV to XVII CC) at the Ivan Franko Lviv University.

He is Ukrainian, aged 45, (born in 1919), 1941 was mobilized by the Soviet Army, during the war served with Soviet Air Force. His parents had no news from him at that period and thought he was dead. Only in 1960 they learned about "Professor KISS Yaroslav" at the Lviv University. They wrote him and ascertained that he was their son indeed. They sent him parcels, tried to get him on visit to the States but after their efforts failed, decided to visit him in Lvov.

KIS Yaroslav is married, two boys (aged 16 and 13). He belongs to upper class of Soviet intelligentsia, is a good specialist, very popular at the University, and well off. No party-man though at one time applied for membership and was refused. Later on he was proposed to ~~rejoin~~ join the party but then he refused to.

N.B. In "Bibliographical Guide" of Ivan Franko Lviv Uni of 1962 KIS' YAROSLAV Pavlovych is listed as "docent, Candidate of Historical Sciences, at Lviv Uni since 1948, Dept of History of Ukraine, graduated from Lviv Uni in 1948, Candidate thesis: Peasants of Lviv Suburban Villages of XV to XVII CC, published in 1953 by Lviv University".

CS COPY

28 Feb 1964

74-124-27/3 74-124-296

Other works by KISS Yaroslav enumerated in "Bibliographical Guide" deal also with history of Lviv and its environments in XV to XVII CC.

Source avoided names and other personal data. He stressed also that he didn't want his informations to be used in any way publicly, because this might hurt his son's position. Besides, he plans eventually to visit his son again and perhaps even stay there for good provided he could retain his US citizenship and pension.

Talks at Yaroslav's house in Lviv were quite free and open. Source met there many friends of Yaroslav, mostly his colleagues by profession, and they also discussed political matters. Yaroslav was rather reticent in criticizing openly the Soviet system but others and in particular Yaroslav's elder son was very vehement in attacking Russian communists. He did it usually when he was alone with his grandfather.

2. Source and his wife made their first actual stop in the Soviet Union in Kiev whereto they arrived by plane from Moscow. They were accomodated in hotel and given an Inturist guide (a girl). With her they visited Pecherska Lavra, Sofia Sobor, Shevchenko Museum and other sightseeing spots. In the Opera they saw "La Traviata".

In the Museum they had an encounter with a group of school girls and boys aged 13-15 who came from 3 different schools. After two or so hours girls and boys were resting in the hall. Source approached them and asked whether they were tired. Source's wife interfered in the meantime and told her husband he should not talk to them in Ukrainian because they probably knew only Russian. At that moment one girl stood up, flushed, and evenmently protested emphasizing that they all were Ukrainian and spoke Ukrainian very well. Source's wife remark theyall regard as a deep offence to them.

3. The Inturist guide was Ukrainian, in the beginning she spoke English but after Source told her "to speak the language her mother taught her" she used only Ukrainian. In general she was rather cautious and avoided controversial topics. Only once when Source remarked that Kiev itself was very nice but the Bolsheviks had destroyed much of Ukrainian culture and russified the capital of the Ukraine, and even "expelled God from churches", the guide replied : "If there were a God he could not calmly observe (tolerate) what was happening in Ukraine!"

4. From KIEV to LVOV Source and his wife went by train. At the RR Station Lvov they were met by their son Yaroslav, his family and some friends. Source's wife did not recognize her son at once, so much he had changed. From the RR Station all went to Yaroslav's apartment in Zhovtneva vulytsia. The apartment was nicely furnished (the furniture was from Carpatho-Ukraine; it is being considered as most fashionable now in the Ukraine) and consisted of 3 rooms and kitchen. The furniture Yaroslav bought for parcels he was receiving from his parents in the States (altogether they sent him about \$ 1,600.-) .

5. According to what Source was told by his son and his friends they all were basically or rather theoretically reconciled with communist system as such but wanted it to be reformed and changed towards more freedom to non-Russians and freedom and liberties in general. They all were conscious Ukrainians and Source described them "patriotic Ukrainian communists". They criticized strongly many aspects of Soviet reality and in particular Khrushchev's nationalities policy. Thus , in their opinion, the School Bill of 1958 -1959 was something so vehemently anti-anti-Ukrainian that even Stalin would have not dared . The respective school bill was simply a camouflaged fullfledged attack against Ukrainian schools unparalleled in the whole history of the Soviet Union.

According to what they were told by their relatives the two villages presented two sharp contrasts. In ZASTAVTSI people were relatively well off. Almost all were employed with collective farm and got a not too bad remuneration. In addition, they have their own poultry, cows and pigs, and participate quite actively in trade on Lvov and Buchach markets. The chairman of collective farm is a Ukrainian from Lemkivshchyna and a good manager. The people like him and praise. Naturally, Source's relatives came from ZASTAVTSI to LVOV with much food and drink.

A completely different situation is in PIDMYKHAILIVTSI. There is a very bad chairman of the collective farm and people live in terrible misery. Remuneration is low and irregular. Peasants are unwilling to work and work badly. 73 cows perished from TB in one year. As a reflection on the situation Source's relatives from PIDMYKHAILIVTSI came "with empty hands and terribly complained".

7. During Source's sojourn in LVOV he saw long queues for food. There was no "white bread" and the "black one" was much worse than usual. People were quite apprehensive about food situation.

8. In LVOV Ukrainian was prevailing. Then came Russian. Very seldom someone spoke Polish.

9. Source mentioned Prof YARYTSKYI, fnu of LVOV, a friend of his son, ~~XXXXXX~~ and PYRIZHOK, Andrei Markovych - a generally known speculant "who can sell and buy everything that has a price".

Still ,in spite of the present Russification drive they were quite optimistic in their appraisal of Ukrainian situation in the future. They put great hopes on vacillations of party politics ~~at~~ the top and expected new changes and zigzags of which Ukrainians will be able to avail themselves. As for the present they considered it as most ~~unfavorable~~ unfavorable for Ukrainians and their main task ^{it} saw in enduring ^{it} by defending all Ukrainian against Russian chauvinistic drive. In their view, however, the situation must soon change and Ukrainians will have ~~new~~ chances to gain new concessions and strengthen their position inside the Soviet Union.

As to emigration - in their opinion - it should be less concerned with "liberating them" but rather concentrate on scholarly and informative work that cannot be done in the Ukraine. In this connection they praised the publication of Ukrainian Encyclopedia abroad (Yaroslav has one set himself), and erection of Shevchenko monument in Washington, D.C. Some of them had access to "Svoboda" and read in it about "the Shevchenko affair in the USA". They pointed out that they were capable of handling ^{the} inside situation by themselves and that the present system in the Ukraine ~~could not~~ and will be changed or removed only by "those who had grown up in communism."

They wanted as many as possible Ukrainian emigrants to come on visit to the Ukraine. At the same time they complained that all visitors till now were either communists (progressives) or outspoken anti-communists. They would like , however, to see "usual Ukrainians".

6. During Source's stay in Lviv they were also visited by relatives from two villages : ZASTAVTSI, r-n PIDHAITSI; and PIDMYKHAILIVTSI, r-n RADEKHIV.

CS COPY

74-124-2913

SECRET

SUBJECT: ~~X~~ SMIRNOV, Igor

8-06 60-1929 A.C.D. 455K

SOURCE: A.S.M.Y.

SUBJECT CITIZEN guest lecturer, ~~at~~

DATE: 28 Feb 1964

Cornell from ? - 1 Jan. 1964

~~Source CP Had contact with~~

~~H. SPYK~~

1. Subject is Russian, of Moscow, aged 35, graduate of Moscow State University, at Cornell till end-Jan 64 as lecturer of Russian (instructor native speaker). Party member, intelligent, quite friendly. Spoke fair English with heavy Slavic accent. According to Russian emigres who met Subject his Russian accent indicated that he was from Moscow indeed.

and approached the subject at the same time of the lecture
Source went two times to Subject's lectures. They went together to the movies (Subject liked cinema), had a drink from time to time, and met at least once a week on the campus. Once Subject visited Source at his address. When asked by Source to spend Christmas at Source's parents' home in Utica, Subject promised to do so but then at the last moment excused himself with some urgent business.

Subject was always correct, tactful. He avoided, however, political topics and restricted himself to generalities and banalities. He liked to talk about American women who in his view were more feminine than the Soviet ones. This he attributed to the way American women dress. He didn't mind talking about America either but as soon as Source touched on a political and moreover controversial topic Subject used to switch over to women, weather, daily life at the campus. He himself had a private room in William Street.

Subject described himself as a convinced atheist and communist, and in Source's opinion he indeed was.

Subject liked American cigarettes and did not mind drinks, but only a few.

SECRET

28 Feb

When leaving for the USSR via New York Subject was unwilling to exchange addresses and told Source about his departure only when shaking hands for good-by.

Though well paid at Cornell Subject wore his Soviet clothes all the time which were quite modest.

Subject had altogether about 12 lectures. Beside Soviet press Source saw him read also "The Cornell Sun", "The Ithaca Times", "The New York Times", "Time", "Life", "Newsweek" and other magazines. Subject found them either in the library or was given by Source. He was, however, unwilling to accept Russian books printed here. ^{He only} ~~He took~~ "The Red Manager" and read it.

-II-

Some opinions expressed by Subject

1. Collective farms

In the near future collective farms will have to be transformed into state farms because the former are conducive to revival of some "old tendencies" among peasants. It was true that collective farmers spent much more time and devote much more attention and care to their household plots than to collective farm itself. In Subject's opinion this was the main cause of "partial failure" of Soviet agriculture and it will continue so until all farmers will be turned into agricultural workers what could be achieved only by overall introduction of state farms. The party is aware of that and soon will intensify its agricultural policy along this line.

2. The great future of Russian language and culture

Russian is lingua franca of the Soviet Union and will remain so. Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Georgian and other non-Russian languages will disappear in the future. At the same time these languages will enreach Russian or rather

~~SECRET~~

new Soviet language. The same process will take place in culture. The Russian culture is dominating to-day and will do so in the future. It will also be enreached by other nations' contributions and in result it will be a truly Soviet one. Subject refused to identify explicitly Russian with Soviet but by implication, in the long run, these two terms were for him even synonymous. At one point he pointed out that Ukrainian and other non-Russian languages were for him somewhere in the middle between old Slavic language and the present Russian ^{meaning} ~~indicating~~ that old Slavic he regarded to be a dead language, Ukrainian, Georgian and others - dying out and being more on the status of dialects, and Russian - rapidly advancing.

3. USSR versus USA

USSR is interested in peace and coexistence. It cannot, however, admit an ideological coexistence. Therefore, there will be always some tensions between the two great powers. Subject personally would prefer that there would be none but this was not possible "by nature of things". What he would like, however, to see, is a reduction of controversy to a simple competition. Such a limited rivalry would be in ^{the} interest of both; USSR and USA.

Subject was quite impressed with things American. But he would not prefer American to his own country. Moreover that sooner or later the USSR will achieve similar abundance of material goods as it is now in the States and even outstrip the latter. Americans had prosperity but no worthy purpose, no sense to live for. The USSR was maybe much poorer but it gave people "sense of life".

Great industrial achievements in the past and and at the present guarantee that Soviet Union will overtake the USA and failures in agriculture or in some branches of industry are just "natural growing pains" of something really great.

~~SECRET~~

4. Stalinism and the present

SECRET

Stalin made many mistakes but he also did much good. Anyway, bygone is bygone, and Stalinism cannot return. Critique of abstractionism, modernism etc. does not mean a reversal towards Stalinism. He doesn't know personally neither YEVTUSHENKO nor anybody else of "those people", and he ~~has~~ read about them much more in "Life" magazine than he had heard in the Soviet Union. His conclusion: the Western propaganda deliberately emphasizes some aspects of Soviet life to score some extra points in propaganda war. This is also the case with Yevtushenko and his like.

5. Religion

Only elderly people go to church. Facts about some young people allegedly adhering to church are in his opinion credited abroad with too much exaggeration and distortion.

6. American movies

They are technically superb but "lack ideas". Very often they are so banal and senseless that one wonders for whom they were produced. Subject praised some new Soviet films in particular. These were "Cranes are flying", "The Soldier's Ballade" and in his opinion Americans had nothing like it.

SECRET